

instance, Lord Kintore deserves no more credit for being Lord Kintore than the merest gutter child deserves blame for being a gutter child. To praise him for being born is to stultify oneself, for it did not rest with him to be born the heir to an earldom or to an oyster shop. It is right and proper to praise Lord Kintore for what he has done, and it is possibly justifiable to praise him for what he is going to do. But to praise him for what his father and mother have done seems to me to be absurd.

And for thinking so—for making as little of Lord Kintore's birth as Mr. Havisham in "Little Lord Fauntleroy" seemed to make of the "ancient lineage" of the respectable apple-woman—I am assured by the Chief Justice that I cannot have the advantages which I affect to despise. Possibly not. One must bow to so decided an opinion from so eminent an authority on the subject. But despite his eminence, I maintain that his proposition is not true; that it should run that the advantages of high rank and long and honoured lineage are advantages which only those who do not possess make so much fuss about.—I am, Sir, &c.,
J. CHEYNE WHARTON.

The Register.

ADELAIDE: FRIDAY, JUNE 7, 1889.

THE EDUCATION REPORT.

There is an annually increasing feeling of interest in the reports of the Education Department. We hear so much about this department in the intervals that those amongst us who are prepared to believe everything we hear are fearful lest each report should be the last. The department, say some, administers a "heathen" system of education; others, not so unkind, claim that the system is merely "godless," whilst another party, which worries not so much about the religious aspect of the teaching imparted as about its merely terrestrial value, tells us with portentous wagging of the head that the system, excellent as it may be, must break down of its own weight. We look in vain through each annual report for evidences of heathendom and ungodliness, or for signs of the inevitable disruption. Whilst its critics are using bad language and prophesying uncomfortable things, the department is to all appearance pursuing the even tenor of its way without paying the slightest attention to the prophets of evil. And to all appearance the way of the department is not hard. Every year finds it prepared to admit failures when there are failures; and to claim successes. It does not require a Solomon to judge on the relative value of the failures and of the successes, for the mere existence of the institution, which would be impossible if all that is said against it were true, is a triumphant proof of its excellence. Steering its course along the middle way—avoiding sectarianism on the one side and utilitarianism on the other—the educational system of South Australia is one which should commend itself to the support of fair-minded citizens. It has its faults. For our own part we still believe that it aims too high, and that, especially in the matter of the the Advanced School for Girls, it unduly and improperly interferes with private enterprise. But this evil of translating elementary education into a knowledge of more than the rudiments, is one which is bound to decrease with the growth of the colony.

In the report of the Minister of Education, which was yesterday presented to Parliament, the enthusiast in educational matters will first look for an account of

the success of the new arrangement, the teaching of drawing and the instruction in elementary science. But before one can gratify his natural curiosity in these respects it is abundantly necessary to consider what the State-school system has cost the country. Pounds, shillings, and pence are vulgar things, but on them hinges the position of the best persons and things in the world. Let us, then, look at the accounts for a moment. Last year 45,236 children were instructed throughout the colony—or more than have ever been taught before in any one year. The teaching of these children—including everything but the expenditure on buildings, which was defrayed from another than the Educational vote—cost £103,330. How does this sum compare with the returns for former years? Last year the total cost, with the same exception, was £106,000; in 1886 it was £104,000, and in the preceding year it was by £13 less than in 1888. The importance of this comparison becomes evident when we call to mind the number of scholars and the cost per head, which it will be well to mention only for the years 1885 and 1888. In 1885 there were 472 schools, with an average attendance of 27,005 pupils, conducted at an average cost of £2 15s. 0½d. per child in average attendance. In 1888 the schools numbered 536, and the average attendance amounted to 28,329, whilst the cost per head was 3d. more than in 1885. One does not want to make little of this increase in expenditure, though at the same time it is right to point out that if the compulsory clause alone is taken into consideration the cost per head is only 10½d. as against 1s. 4d. in 1885. With all the facts and figures before us, it is impossible to get over the feeling that, granted the necessity for a State system of education, the scheme adopted in this colony is worthy of support and commanding of praise.

Now the way is clear to us for the consideration of what we may call the æsthetical points of the report, with the place of honour assigned, as is most fitting, to the subjects most recently introduced into the curriculum. The Inspector-General evidently does not care very much about the inclusion of drawing and elementary science. He probably thinks that he has done as much as is possible in the way of cramming the memories of the boys and girls who attend the State schools, and rather resents as

cruel the movement of the Technical Commission. If this is his state of mind he will doubtless command the adherence of many supporters who stick to the old-fashioned theory that *non multa, sed multum* should be the order of the day in education. It ill becomes Mr. Hartley of all men in the world to take this stand, for he has done a great deal both in his position as the permanent head of the Education Department and as a member of the University Council to advance the contrary proposition, *non multum, sed multa*. However, he is decided enough in regard to the new subjects. These “can only be introduced very gradually; the students have not been remarkably successful.” Possibly the results may be better in future years, but meanwhile it may be hoped that influential enthusiasts will forbear from inflicting their theories of education upon the department. It would be all very